



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/875,814	06/05/2001	Ashvinkumar J. Sanghvi	MS1-689US	5999

22801 7590 11/24/2006

LEE & HAYES PLLC  
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500  
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Supplemental  
Notice of Allowability**

Application No.

09/875,814

Examiner

Mohammad A. Siddiqi

Applicant(s)

SANGHVI ET AL.

Art Unit

2154

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--**

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to 06/28/2006.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 1-5, 7-20, and 23-26 (rearranged claims are 1-23).
3. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of the:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.

**THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.**

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
5. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
- (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
- 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                     |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413),<br>Paper No./Mail Date _____ |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08),<br>Paper No./Mail Date _____    | 7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Amendment/Comment                   |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit<br>of Biological Material | 8. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance             |
|  | 9. <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____   |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT**

1. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Paul Mitchell (509-324-9256X237) on 08/30/2006.

2. Please amend the claims as attached.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A. Siddiqi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3976. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-

3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MAS

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please amend the claims as follows:

1. (Currently Amended) A computer-implemented method comprising:  
identifying multiple policy templates ~~ies~~ to be combined together;  
determining whether any conflicts exist between the multiple policy  
templates ~~ies~~;  
adding non-conflicting policy templates ~~ies~~ to a merged policy set;  
resolving conflicting policy templates ~~ies~~ by:  
~~selecting a preferred policy based on an allowed range of policy values; and~~  
~~including the preferred policy in the merged policy set by~~  
arranging conflicting policy templates in relative order from most  
global policy templates ~~policies~~ to most local policy templates;  
~~policies, the arranging act creating a listing that includes a global~~  
~~policy template at one end and a local policy template at another~~  
~~end;~~  
determining an intersection of the conflicting policy templates,  
effective that a majority ~~at least a plurality~~ of the conflicting  
policy templates falling at least partially within the intersection;  
identifying a preferred value within each of the conflicting policy  
templates;

comparing individual conflicting policy templates to one another;

selecting a preferred individual one of the conflicting policy

templates that is relatively more local and that has its preferred

value within the intersection; and,

~~selecting the preferred policy template based on the intersection  
of the conflicting policy templates.~~

adding the preferred individual one of the conflicting policy templates  
to the merged policy set.

2. (Original) A method as recited in claim 1 wherein the preferred policy template represents a preferred range of values associated with at least one of the multiple policyies- templates.
3. (Original) A method as recited in claim 1 further comprising determining an allowed range of values associated with the multiple policyies templates.

4. (Previously Amended) A method as recited in claim 1 wherein the preferred policy template is contained within the allowed range of values associated with the multiple policyies- templates.

5. (Previously Amended) A method as recited in claim 1 further comprising deleting policies that are outside the allowed range of values, wherein the allowed range of values is associated with the multiple policyies templates.

6. (Canceled)

7. (Currently Amended) A method as recited in claim 1 wherein selecting a preferred policy includes:

~~arranging conflicting policy templates in order from global policies to local policies;~~

~~determining an intersection of the conflicting policy templates; and~~

selecting the preferred policy template based on the policy template closest to the local policyies- templates and within the intersection of the conflicting policy templates.

8. (Original) A method as recited in claim 1 wherein the policyies templates are event-handling policyies- templates.
9. (Original) A method as recited in claim 1 wherein the policyies templates define how a device is to be configured.
10. (Original) A method as recited in claim 1 wherein the policyies templates identify the types of events that are provided to each device.
11. (Original) A method as recited in claim 1 wherein resolving conflicting policyies- templates includes comparing related policyies- templates individually.
12. (Original) A method as recited in claim 1 wherein the method is implemented by a management module.



13. (Original) One or more computer-readable memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in claim 1.

14. (Currently Amended) A computer-implemented method comprising:  
identifying multiple policies to be combined together;  
determining whether any conflicts exist between the multiple policies;  
adding non-conflicting policies to a merged policy set;  
arranging conflicting policies from global policies to local policies, the  
arranging act creating a listing that includes a global policy at one end and a  
local policy at another end;  
determining an intersection of the conflicting policies, at least a plurality of  
the conflicting policies falling at least partially within the intersection; and  
selecting a preferred policy based on the policy closest to the local policies  
and within the intersection of the conflicting policies.

15. (Original) A method as recited in claim 14 wherein the preferred policy represents a preferred range of values associated with at least one of the multiple policies.

16. (Original) A method as recited in claim 15 further comprising deleting policies that are outside the preferred range of values.

17. (Original) A method as recited in claim 14 wherein the policies are event-handling policies.

18. (Original) A method as recited in claim 14 wherein the policies determine how an associated device is configured.

19. (Original) One or more computer-readable memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in claim 14.

20. (Currently Amended) An apparatus comprising:  
a storage device configured to store a merged policy set; and  
a management module coupled to the storage device and configured to identify multiple policies to be merged into the merged policy set, wherein the management module adds non-conflicting policies to the merged policy

set and resolves conflicts among conflicting policies by selecting a preferred policy based on an allowed range of policy values,

wherein resolving conflicts among conflicting policies includes arranging conflicting policy templates in order from global policies to local policies, the arranging act creating a listing that includes a global policy template at one end and a local policy template at another end, determining the intersection of the conflicting policy templates, at least a plurality of the conflicting policy templates falling at least partially within the intersection, and selecting the preferred policy template based on the policy template that is closest to the local policies and within the intersection of the conflicting policy templates.

21. (Canceled)

22. (Canceled)

23. (Original) An apparatus as recited in claim 20 wherein the management module is part of an enterprise computing system.

24. (Original) An apparatus as recited in claim 20 wherein the management module receives event data generated by a plurality of event providers coupled to the management module.

25. (Original) An apparatus as recited in claim 20 wherein the multiple policies define how devices are configured in an enterprise.

26. (Original) An apparatus as recited in claim 20 wherein the multiple policies identify the types of events that are provided to each device in an enterprise.

27. (Canceled)

28. (Canceled)

29. (Canceled)

Application/Control Number: 09/875,814  
Art Unit: 2154

Page 12

LARRY D. DONAGHUE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Larry D. Donaghue", is written over the printed name and title. The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.